

I am surprised and astonished to hear that Sinclair intends to air 'Stolen Honor,' a blatantly partisan attack of dubious veracity, as a legitimate news story. I do not believe that this constitutes 'news,' but rather the attempt to sway voters' opinions of John Kerry through unsubstantiated claims. This is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

There are many partisan documentaries being produced these days, understandably, as we are a deeply divided nation with strong convictions on either side. However, these perhaps propagandistic documentaries are being shown in movie theatres or available for rental. Therefore, if someone wants to watch 'Outfoxed,' they are making a clear choice to pay for something which they likely already know to be slanted. Most likely, people watch these pieces to reinforce views that they already have, and, while they may find parts surprising, it is probably not unexpected, as they have made a conscious effort to learn what one side of the political spectrum has to offer.

However, showing a slanted program, the factual accuracy of which has not been duly verified, on national television, disguised as unbiased *truth* is ethically irresponsible, journalistically misleading, and cheapens the political process by giving major media corporations the ability to strongly influence people who don't know any better, people who turn to network news for *news* not for the airing of dishonest reports designed only to sabotage a candidate's honor.

I feel that it is wrong in every way to show a piece like this as news, however, if the decision is irrevocable, I believe that to maintain any semblance of fairness, Sinclair must also show a similarly partisan documentary produced by the other side of the political spectrum. I think as a whole this country is woefully uninformed about most things, politics especially, and it seems obvious to me that showing a blatantly conservative piece like this so close to the election is intended only to help Bush by tarnishing Kerry's honor. And while this is a natural and necessary goal of those who make politically-motivated documentaries, it is *not* supposed to be the job of the mainstream media to advance these opinions on either side.

This is a democracy. It is up to the *people*, not the wealthy media conglomerates, to decide who will be our next president. The job of the media is to give the people the best possible tools with which to make this decision, *not* to sway public opinion by presenting only one viewpoint. If Sinclair is going to air 'Stolen Honor' it *must* also air 'Going Upriver,' perhaps, or any other available liberally-slanted piece. Otherwise I believe there will be no credibility left to the idea of balanced journalism.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve

more than a returned postcard. Thank you.

Oriana